



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/762,388	01/22/2004	James L. Madara	7210.03	4854
7590		12/13/2007	EXAMINER	
Scott D. Rothenberger			FAY, ZOHREH A	
DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Suite 1500			1618	
50 South Sixth Street				
Minneapolis, MN 55402-1498				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/13/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/762,388	MADARA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Zohreh A. Fay	1618	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3-MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9/24/2007.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 15-27 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 15-27 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

Claims 15-27 are presented for examination.

The remarks filed on September 24, 2007 have been received and entered.

Claims 15 is are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by WO 90/13292 for the reasons set forth on page 2 of the office action of August 28, 2007.

Claims 15-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph for the reasons set forth on pages 2-5 of the office action of August 28, 2007.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 15-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 90/13292 in view of Applicant's admission.

The WO Patent reference has been discussed previously. Such reference differs from the claimed invention in the use of specific Lipoxin analogues of claims 16-27. Applicant on page 16 of the specification refers to different sources, such as articles and patents to show that the compounds claimed in claims 16-27 are lipoxin A4 analogues. It would have been obvious for a person skilled in the art to use the specific compounds of claims 17-27 for the treatment of inflammation, motivated by applicant's admission that such compounds are lipoxin A4 analogues' and have anti-inflammatory activity.

One skilled in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of the above references, since one relates to the use of lipoxin A4 analogues in general for the treatment of inflammatory disorders, and the other relates to the compounds of claims 17-27 as well known lipoxin A4analogs having anti-inflammatory activity. Applicant has presented no evidence to establish the unexpected or unobvious nature of the claimed invention, and as such, claims 15-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a)..

Applicant's arguments, remarks and declaration regarding the 112 first paragraph have been carefully considered, but are not deemed to be persuasive. The claims of the instant application are drawn to the use of any lipoxin A4 analogue for the treatment of any columnar epithelial disorder. The instant specification quite simply fails to enable

a person skilled in the art to make and use any lipoxin A4 analogue for the treatment of any inflammatory condition associated with columnar epithelial. Furthermore, the state of the art does not recognize that all the inflammatory conditions can be treated with one anti-inflammatory agent. Applicant's arguments regarding the 102 (b) rejection have been carefully considered, but are not deemed to be persuasive. Applicant alleges criticality to the advantages of lipoxin A4 analogues, by having a longer half life. Applicant is defining the lipoxine analogues with what they do and not what they are. Applicant is reminded that claim 15 is directed to lipoxin analogues in general which covers any lipoxin analogue.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zohreh A. Fay whose telephone number is (571) 272-0573. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Hartley can be reached on (571) 272-0616. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Z.F

/Zohreh Fay/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1618

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Zohreh Fay".